

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

* * *

1 CHIBUEZE C. ANAEME,)
2)
3 Plaintiff,) 2:12-cv-01274-MMD -VCF
4)
5 v.)
6)
7)
8)
9)
10)
11)
12)
13)
14)
15)
16)
17)
18)
19)
20)
21)
22)
23)
24)
25)
26)
CHIBUEZE C. ANAEME,)
v.)
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, *et al.*,)
Defendants.)
CHIBUEZE C. ANAEME,)
v.)
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, *et al.*,)
Defendants.)
CHIBUEZE C. ANAEME,)
v.)
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, *et al.*,)
Defendants.)
CHIBUEZE C. ANAEME,)
v.)
Plaintiff,) 2:12-cv-01275-MMD -VCF
Defendants.)
CHIBUEZE C. ANAEME,)
v.)
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, *et al.*,)
Defendants.)
CHIBUEZE C. ANAEME,)
v.)
Plaintiff,) 2:12-cv-01276-JCM -VCF
Defendants.)
CHIBUEZE C. ANAEME,)
v.)
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, *et al.*,)
Defendants.)
CHIBUEZE C. ANAEME,)
v.)
Plaintiff,) 2:12-cv-01277-MMD -VCF
Defendants.)
REPORT & RECOMMENDATION
BARRING FUTURE FILINGS AND
DISMISSAL OF CLAIMS
(Response to Order To Show Cause)
REPORT & RECOMMENDATION
BARRING FUTURE FILINGS AND
DISMISSAL OF CLAIMS
(Response to Order To Show Cause)
REPORT & RECOMMENDATION
BARRING FUTURE FILINGS AND
DISMISSAL OF CLAIMS
(Response to Order To Show Cause)
REPORT & RECOMMENDATION
BARRING FUTURE FILINGS AND
DISMISSAL OF CLAIMS

1 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, *et al.*,) (Response to Order To Show Cause)
2 Defendants.)
3 CHIBUEZE C. ANAEME,)
4 Plaintiff,)
5 v.)
6)
7 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, *et al.*,)
8 Defendants.) (Response to Order To Show Cause)
9)
10 CHIBUEZE C. ANAEME,)
11 Plaintiff,)
12 v.)
13)
14 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, *et al.*,)
15 Defendants.) (Response to Order To Show Cause)
16)
17 CHIBUEZE C. ANAEME,)
18 Plaintiff,)
19 v.)
20)
21 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, *et al.*,)
22 Defendants.) (Response to Order To Show Cause)
23)
24)
25)
26)

REPORT & RECOMMENDATION
BARRING FUTURE FILINGS AND
DISMISSAL OF CLAIMS

2:12-cv-01278-GMN -VCF

REPORT & RECOMMENDATION
BARRING FUTURE FILINGS AND
DISMISSAL OF CLAIMS

2:12-cv-01279-JCM -VCF

REPORT & RECOMMENDATION
BARRING FUTURE FILINGS AND
DISMISSAL OF CLAIMS

2:12-cv-01280-MMD -VCF

REPORT & RECOMMENDATION
BARRING FUTURE FILINGS AND
DISMISSAL OF CLAIMS

BACKGROUND

Before the court are plaintiff Chibueze C. Anaeme's Responses to the Court's Orders To Show Cause in the Above Captioned Actions.

I. Order To Show Cause

A. Background

Plaintiff filed fourteen (14) actions in this court since September 28, 2011, some of which are not before the undersigned Magistrate Judge. The allegations in the complaints fall into four (4) categories: (1) transfer of plaintiff's pharmacy license (2:11-cv-01572-PMP -RJJ, 2:11-cv-01573-JCM -PAL, 2:12-cv-01041-MMD-VCF, 2:12-cv-01160-JCM-VCF, 2:12-cv-01162-GMN-VCF, 2:12-cv-01275-MMD -VCF, and 2:12-cv-01276-JCM -VCF), (2) attorneys not returning documents to plaintiff (2:12-cv-01038-GMN -VCF and 2:12-cv-01279-JCM -VCF), (3) a dispute over a storage unit agreement, (2:12-cv-01182-GMN -VCF, 2:12-cv-01277-MMD -VCF, 2:12-cv-01278-GMN -VCF, and 2:12-cv-01280-MMD -VCF), and (4) a dispute arising out of the purchase of a Toyota Sienna (2:12-cv-01274-MMD -VCF). This court denied *in forma pauperis* in two of plaintiff's actions (2:11-cv-01572-PMP -RJJ and 2:12-cv-01162-GMN-VCF) and granted *in forma pauperis* and either recommended dismissal of or dismissed the complaint in two of plaintiff's actions (2:11-cv-01573-JCM -PAL and 2:12-cv-01038-GMN -VCF). The remaining actions have been transferred to the undersigned Magistrate Judge.

1. Actions Before This Court

In each of plaintiff's actions before this court, he filed a motion/application to proceed *in forma pauperis*. (#1)¹. He alleged in all of the motions/applications that he was unable to pay the \$350 filing fees. *Id.* The court held a hearing on plaintiff's motion to proceed *in forma pauperis* in Case No. 2:12-cv-01038-GMN-VCF, and plaintiff represented during the hearing that he is not currently

¹ All docket numbers herein refer to the docket entries for each of the above captioned actions unless stated otherwise.

1 employed, that he last worked as a pharmacist from October 2007 - December 2007, and that he made
 2 \$150 per hour during that time.

3 Each of the complaints before the undersigned Magistrate Judge are between forty-eight (48)
 4 to sixty (60) pages long, name between forty-seven (47) to one-hundred and twenty-one (121)
 5 defendants (many of which are the same), and seek relief against other parties that are not named as
 6 defendants. (#1-1). The claims are disjointed, repetitive, and exceptionally difficult to follow. *Id.* Not
 7 only are the allegations and claims within plaintiff's complaints (#1-1) repetitive, but the actions
 8 themselves are duplicative of each other (as evidenced by the categories of topics discussed above) and
 9 of actions filed and dismissed in other districts (discussed below).

10 On September 6, 2012, the undersigned Magistrate Judge entered an order and report and
 11 recommendation in each of the actions before this court. (#3, #4², and #5³). In the order, the court
 12 granted plaintiff's requests to proceed *in forma pauperis* pursuant to § 1915(a). *Id.* Upon screening the
 13 complaint, the court found that this court is not the proper venue based on both the residency of the
 14 defendants under 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b)(1) and where a substantial amount of the events or omissions
 15 occurred under 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b)(2). *Id.* The court found that after reviewing "plaintiff's complaints
 16 (#1) and history as a litigant in Federal Court," transferring these actions to a federal district where
 17 venue is proper is not "in the interest of justice." *Id;* See 28 U.S.C. § 1404(a).

18 The court held that, on or before October 10, 2012, plaintiff must "show cause why the United
 19 States District Court for the District of Nevada should not enjoin plaintiff...from filing any future *pro
 20 se* actions in this district and should not DISMISS his complaints." *Id.* The court stated that failure to
 21 file a response would result in a report and recommendation recommending that "the court enter an
 22 order dismissing the above captioned actions with prejudice and enjoining plaintiff from filing in this

24
 25 ²Case Nos. 12-cv-01274-MMD-VCF and 12-cv-01276-JCM-VCF
 26

³Case No. 12-cv-01182-GMN-VCF

1 district.” *Id.* On September 14, 2012, plaintiff filed responses to the order to show cause. (#4, #5⁴, and
 2 #6⁵). Plaintiff’s responses are as follows:

3 The complaint as filed by plaintiff *pro se* in aforerecited (sic) cause is
 4 proper.

5 The aforementioned cause of action was thoroughly and/or extensively
 6 investigated by plaintiff over several years prior to initiation of the
 7 corresponding litigation.

8 The gravamen of the court assertions against plaintiff allegations and
 9 claims in said cause is grounded on the fact that this court lacks proper
 10 judicial notice, proper case knowledge and focus as pertains to said
 11 cause and similarly of any other previous cause of action related to
 12 plaintiff in any other court, to which it alluded to in its aforerecited (sic)
 13 applicable order dated September 6, 2012, namely, USDC District of
 14 Colorado Case No.1:12-CV-00460-LTB, USDC Southern District of
 15 California Case No.3:11-CV-1906-JAH-WVG, USDC Southern District
 16 of California Case No.3:11-CV-I808-JAH-BLM ,USDC Southern
 17 District of California Case No.3:11-CV- 1605-LAB-MDD and USDC
 18 District of New Mexico cause of action (No case no(s).listed).

19 *Id.* Each of plaintiff’s responses are identical, with the exception of the response filed in Case No. 12-
 20 cv-01041-MMD-VCF, which does not include the second paragraph. *Id.*

21 **2. Plaintiff’s Filing History In Other Districts**

22 In 2011, plaintiff filed three actions in the District of Southern California (3:11-cv-1906-JAH-
 23 WVG, 3:11-cv-1808-JAH-BLM, and 3:11-cv-1605-LAB-MDD) naming several of the same defendants
 24 named in the actions before this court. All three of plaintiff’s complaints in California were dismissed
 25 *sua sponte*. Case Nos. 2:12-cv-01038-GMN -VCF and 2:12-cv-01279-JCM -VCF filed in this court
 26 are nearly identical to an action plaintiff filed in the United States District Court for the District of
 Colorado on February 22, 2012 (Case No. 1:12-cv-00460-LTB) (hereinafter the “Colorado Action”).
 In the Colorado Action, plaintiff asserted that attorneys who represented him in the State of New

27
 28
 29
 30
 31
 32
 33
 34
 35
 36
 37
 38
 39
 40
 41
 42
 43
 44
 45
 46
 47
 48
 49
 50
 51
 52
 53
 54
 55
 56
 57
 58
 59
 60
 61
 62
 63
 64
 65
 66
 67
 68
 69
 70
 71
 72
 73
 74
 75
 76
 77
 78
 79
 80
 81
 82
 83
 84
 85
 86
 87
 88
 89
 90
 91
 92
 93
 94
 95
 96
 97
 98
 99
 100
 101
 102
 103
 104
 105
 106
 107
 108
 109
 110
 111
 112
 113
 114
 115
 116
 117
 118
 119
 120
 121
 122
 123
 124
 125
 126
 127
 128
 129
 130
 131
 132
 133
 134
 135
 136
 137
 138
 139
 140
 141
 142
 143
 144
 145
 146
 147
 148
 149
 150
 151
 152
 153
 154
 155
 156
 157
 158
 159
 160
 161
 162
 163
 164
 165
 166
 167
 168
 169
 170
 171
 172
 173
 174
 175
 176
 177
 178
 179
 180
 181
 182
 183
 184
 185
 186
 187
 188
 189
 190
 191
 192
 193
 194
 195
 196
 197
 198
 199
 200
 201
 202
 203
 204
 205
 206
 207
 208
 209
 210
 211
 212
 213
 214
 215
 216
 217
 218
 219
 220
 221
 222
 223
 224
 225
 226
 227
 228
 229
 230
 231
 232
 233
 234
 235
 236
 237
 238
 239
 240
 241
 242
 243
 244
 245
 246
 247
 248
 249
 250
 251
 252
 253
 254
 255
 256
 257
 258
 259
 260
 261
 262
 263
 264
 265
 266
 267
 268
 269
 270
 271
 272
 273
 274
 275
 276
 277
 278
 279
 280
 281
 282
 283
 284
 285
 286
 287
 288
 289
 290
 291
 292
 293
 294
 295
 296
 297
 298
 299
 300
 301
 302
 303
 304
 305
 306
 307
 308
 309
 310
 311
 312
 313
 314
 315
 316
 317
 318
 319
 320
 321
 322
 323
 324
 325
 326
 327
 328
 329
 330
 331
 332
 333
 334
 335
 336
 337
 338
 339
 340
 341
 342
 343
 344
 345
 346
 347
 348
 349
 350
 351
 352
 353
 354
 355
 356
 357
 358
 359
 360
 361
 362
 363
 364
 365
 366
 367
 368
 369
 370
 371
 372
 373
 374
 375
 376
 377
 378
 379
 380
 381
 382
 383
 384
 385
 386
 387
 388
 389
 390
 391
 392
 393
 394
 395
 396
 397
 398
 399
 400
 401
 402
 403
 404
 405
 406
 407
 408
 409
 410
 411
 412
 413
 414
 415
 416
 417
 418
 419
 420
 421
 422
 423
 424
 425
 426
 427
 428
 429
 430
 431
 432
 433
 434
 435
 436
 437
 438
 439
 440
 441
 442
 443
 444
 445
 446
 447
 448
 449
 450
 451
 452
 453
 454
 455
 456
 457
 458
 459
 460
 461
 462
 463
 464
 465
 466
 467
 468
 469
 470
 471
 472
 473
 474
 475
 476
 477
 478
 479
 480
 481
 482
 483
 484
 485
 486
 487
 488
 489
 490
 491
 492
 493
 494
 495
 496
 497
 498
 499
 500
 501
 502
 503
 504
 505
 506
 507
 508
 509
 510
 511
 512
 513
 514
 515
 516
 517
 518
 519
 520
 521
 522
 523
 524
 525
 526
 527
 528
 529
 530
 531
 532
 533
 534
 535
 536
 537
 538
 539
 540
 541
 542
 543
 544
 545
 546
 547
 548
 549
 550
 551
 552
 553
 554
 555
 556
 557
 558
 559
 560
 561
 562
 563
 564
 565
 566
 567
 568
 569
 570
 571
 572
 573
 574
 575
 576
 577
 578
 579
 580
 581
 582
 583
 584
 585
 586
 587
 588
 589
 590
 591
 592
 593
 594
 595
 596
 597
 598
 599
 600
 601
 602
 603
 604
 605
 606
 607
 608
 609
 610
 611
 612
 613
 614
 615
 616
 617
 618
 619
 620
 621
 622
 623
 624
 625
 626
 627
 628
 629
 630
 631
 632
 633
 634
 635
 636
 637
 638
 639
 640
 641
 642
 643
 644
 645
 646
 647
 648
 649
 650
 651
 652
 653
 654
 655
 656
 657
 658
 659
 660
 661
 662
 663
 664
 665
 666
 667
 668
 669
 670
 671
 672
 673
 674
 675
 676
 677
 678
 679
 680
 681
 682
 683
 684
 685
 686
 687
 688
 689
 690
 691
 692
 693
 694
 695
 696
 697
 698
 699
 700
 701
 702
 703
 704
 705
 706
 707
 708
 709
 710
 711
 712
 713
 714
 715
 716
 717
 718
 719
 720
 721
 722
 723
 724
 725
 726
 727
 728
 729
 730
 731
 732
 733
 734
 735
 736
 737
 738
 739
 740
 741
 742
 743
 744
 745
 746
 747
 748
 749
 750
 751
 752
 753
 754
 755
 756
 757
 758
 759
 760
 761
 762
 763
 764
 765
 766
 767
 768
 769
 770
 771
 772
 773
 774
 775
 776
 777
 778
 779
 780
 781
 782
 783
 784
 785
 786
 787
 788
 789
 790
 791
 792
 793
 794
 795
 796
 797
 798
 799
 800
 801
 802
 803
 804
 805
 806
 807
 808
 809
 810
 811
 812
 813
 814
 815
 816
 817
 818
 819
 820
 821
 822
 823
 824
 825
 826
 827
 828
 829
 830
 831
 832
 833
 834
 835
 836
 837
 838
 839
 840
 841
 842
 843
 844
 845
 846
 847
 848
 849
 850
 851
 852
 853
 854
 855
 856
 857
 858
 859
 860
 861
 862
 863
 864
 865
 866
 867
 868
 869
 870
 871
 872
 873
 874
 875
 876
 877
 878
 879
 880
 881
 882
 883
 884
 885
 886
 887
 888
 889
 890
 891
 892
 893
 894
 895
 896
 897
 898
 899
 900
 901
 902
 903
 904
 905
 906
 907
 908
 909
 910
 911
 912
 913
 914
 915
 916
 917
 918
 919
 920
 921
 922
 923
 924
 925
 926
 927
 928
 929
 930
 931
 932
 933
 934
 935
 936
 937
 938
 939
 940
 941
 942
 943
 944
 945
 946
 947
 948
 949
 950
 951
 952
 953
 954
 955
 956
 957
 958
 959
 960
 961
 962
 963
 964
 965
 966
 967
 968
 969
 970
 971
 972
 973
 974
 975
 976
 977
 978
 979
 980
 981
 982
 983
 984
 985
 986
 987
 988
 989
 990
 991
 992
 993
 994
 995
 996
 997
 998
 999
 1000
 1001
 1002
 1003
 1004
 1005
 1006
 1007
 1008
 1009
 10010
 10011
 10012
 10013
 10014
 10015
 10016
 10017
 10018
 10019
 10020
 10021
 10022
 10023
 10024
 10025
 10026
 10027
 10028
 10029
 10030
 10031
 10032
 10033
 10034
 10035
 10036
 10037
 10038
 10039
 10040
 10041
 10042
 10043
 10044
 10045
 10046
 10047
 10048
 10049
 10050
 10051
 10052
 10053
 10054
 10055
 10056
 10057
 10058
 10059
 10060
 10061
 10062
 10063
 10064
 10065
 10066
 10067
 10068
 10069
 10070
 10071
 10072
 10073
 10074
 10075
 10076
 10077
 10078
 10079
 10080
 10081
 10082
 10083
 10084
 10085
 10086
 10087
 10088
 10089
 10090
 10091
 10092
 10093
 10094
 10095
 10096
 10097
 10098
 10099
 100100
 100101
 100102
 100103
 100104
 100105
 100106
 100107
 100108
 100109
 100110
 100111
 100112
 100113
 100114
 100115
 100116
 100117
 100118
 100119
 100120
 100121
 100122
 100123
 100124
 100125
 100126
 100127
 100128
 100129
 100130
 100131
 100132
 100133
 100134
 100135
 100136
 100137
 100138
 100139
 100140
 100141
 100142
 100143
 100144
 100145
 100146
 100147
 100148
 100149
 100150
 100151
 100152
 100153
 100154
 100155
 100156
 100157
 100158
 100159
 100160
 100161
 100162
 100163
 100164
 100165
 100166
 100167
 100168
 100169
 100170
 100171
 100172
 100173
 100174
 100175
 100176
 100177
 100178
 100179
 100180
 100181
 100182
 100183
 100184
 100185
 100186
 100187
 100188
 100189
 100190
 100191
 100192
 100193
 100194
 100195
 100196
 100197
 100198
 100199
 100200
 100201
 100202
 100203
 100204
 100205
 100206
 100207
 100208
 100209
 100210
 100211
 100212
 100213
 100214
 100215
 100216
 100217
 100218
 100219
 100220
 100221
 100222
 100223
 100224
 100225
 100226
 100227
 100228
 100229
 100230
 100231
 100232
 100233
 100234
 100235
 100236
 100237
 100238
 100239
 100240
 100241
 100242
 100243
 100244
 100245
 100246
 100247
 100248
 100249
 100250
 100251
 100252
 100253
 100254
 100255
 100256
 100257
 100258
 100259
 100260
 100261
 100262
 100263
 100264
 100265
 100266
 100267
 100268
 100269
 100270
 100271
 100272
 100273
 100274
 100275
 100276
 100277
 100278
 100279
 100280
 100281
 100282
 100283
 100284
 100285
 100286
 100287
 100288
 100289
 100290
 100291
 100292
 100293
 100294
 100295
 100296
 100297
 100298
 100299
 100300
 100301
 100302
 100303
 100304
 100305
 100306
 100307
 100308
 100309
 100310
 100311
 100312
 100313
 100314
 100315
 100316
 100317
 100318
 100319
 100320
 100321
 100322
 100323
 100324
 100325
 100326
 100327
 100328
 100329
 100330
 100331
 100332
 100333
 100334
 100335
 100336
 100337
 100338
 100339
 100340
 100341
 100342
 100343
 100344
 100345
 100346
 100347
 100348
 100349
 100350
 100351
 100352
 100353
 100354
 100355
 100356
 100357
 100358
 100359
 100360
 100361
 100362
 100363
 100364
 100365
 100366
 100367
 100368
 1003

Mexico refused to return his files to him. (#9)⁶. Upon a review of the plaintiff's complaint, the court in the Colorado Action dismissed the action for lack of proper venue and ordered plaintiff to show cause why he should not be enjoined from filing any future vexatious and frivolous papers in the District of Colorado. *Id.* The court found that transferring the action was inappropriate due to the nature of the complaint before the court and plaintiff's filing history. *Id.*

The court found that plaintiff's complaint could not survive because it (1) was ninety-two pages long, (2) was filled with "disjointed and repetitive" claims, (3) listed over 200 individuals in the complaint and only named five as defendants, (4) was incomprehensible, and (5) did not satisfy jurisdictional requirements. *Id.* The court in the Colorado Action also addressed plaintiff's ability to file actions in that district. *Id.* The court noted that based on the docket from the United States District of New Mexico, plaintiff is "conditionally barred from initiating *pro se* lawsuits in the State of New Mexico without prior approval from the court or representation by a licensed New Mexico attorney..." *Id.* In barring plaintiff, the New Mexico court found that, prior to 2005, plaintiff filed fifteen (15) actions in the District of New Mexico against various private individuals and governmental entities, with another four (4) actions being removed to the District of New Mexico. *Id.* Many of plaintiff's actions that were filed or removed to the New Mexico court named the same entities and individuals, alleged the same claims for relief, and were based on the same factual allegations. *Id.* The New Mexico court attached an appendix to its order enjoining plaintiff, which described plaintiff's history of "frivolous and vexatious" litigation. *Id.* The Colorado court attached the appendix to its order. *Id.*

The Colorado court gave plaintiff thirty (30) days to show cause why he should not be enjoined from future filings. *Id.* On April 16, 2012, plaintiff filed his response to the order to show cause. (#11). On April 30, 2012, the court issued an order imposing filing restrictions on plaintiff. (#12). The Colorado court stated that nothing plaintiff asserted in his response (#11) “shows good cause why the [c]ourt should not subject him to filing restrictions.” *Id.*

⁶ Docket numbers in this section refer to the docket in the Colorado Action (Case No. 1:12-cv-00460-LTB).

B. Dismissal of Claims

1. Relevant Law

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B), a district court “shall dismiss the case at any time if the court determines that . . . the action . . . (1) is frivolous or malicious; (2) fails to state a claim upon which relief may be granted; or (3) seeks monetary relief against a defendant who is immune from such relief.” 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B). The term “frivolous” when applied to a complaint embraces not only the inarguable legal conclusion but also the fanciful factual allegation. *Neitzke v. Williams*, 490 U.S. 319, 325 (1989); *see also Cato v. United States*, 70 F.3d 1103, 1106 (9th Cir. 1995). While an *in forma pauperis* complaint may not be dismissed simply because the court finds the plaintiff’s allegations unlikely, a finding of factual frivolousness is appropriate when the facts alleged rise to the level of the irrational or the wholly incredible, whether or not there are judicially noticeable facts available to contradict them. *Denton v. Hernandez*, 504 U.S. 25, 33 (1992).

2. Screening Plaintiff's Complaints

As discussed above, each of plaintiff's complaints (#1-1) are duplicative of each other and contain repetitive language, making them difficult to comprehend. As the complaints are so lengthy, the court will not address each allegation therein, but will provide examples of the nature of plaintiff's claims.

Plaintiff's complaint in Case No. 2:12-cv-01041-MMD -VCF is forty-eight pages long and names thirty-three (33) different defendants, including several individuals, the San Diego Police Department, the California State Police, and the State of California. (#1-1). In pages 4-29, plaintiff names numerous additional individuals not named in the caption and provides the court with a description of each. *Id.* Beginning under the title "Parties" on page 30, and ending on page 35, plaintiff names more individuals and groups them into "clusters" based on their alleged participation. *Id.*⁷

⁷ The manner in which plaintiff names individuals/defendants described in the two previous sentences is common practice for plaintiff and is found in all of plaintiff's complaints (#1-1)

1 Plaintiff alleges that several clusters engaged in malicious falsehood and, that as a result,
2 plaintiff suffered loss of enjoyment of life, loss of income, loss of property, libel, defamation, slander,
3 damage to property, obstruction of justice, evidence tampering, denial of due process, loss of
4 consortium, denial of proper medical care to name a few in violation" of codes of evidence, immigration
5 laws, ABA Model Rules, etc. *Id.* Plaintiff makes similar blanket claims against the other "clusters,"
6 listing wrongs done against him, but does not provide any factual allegations supporting these claims.

7 *Id.*

8 In Case No. 2:12-cv-01160-JCM -VCF, plaintiff names, lists, and re-lists individuals in the same
9 fashion described above, and, of his sixty (60) page complaint, the first (30) thirty pages consist of these
10 lists. (#1-1). Plaintiff makes some of the same statements as discussed above, and asserts that several
11 of the "clusters" "failed to exercise their responsibility and/or moral obligation to protect public health,
12 safety and welfare and were engaged in and/or aided and abetted, fraudulent inherent and patently
13 irresponsible discriminatory, frivolous, reckless, abusive and malicious acts as aforedescribed (sic) in
14 violation of" Oregon Administrative Rules, Local Rules, ABA Model Rules, etc. *Id.* Once again, there
15 are no coherent factual allegations against any of the clusters, and only these lists of wrongdoing. *Id.*

16 In Case No. 2:12-cv-01182-GMN -VCF, plaintiff's list of defendants spreads from page one to
17 page 34. (#1-1). Defendants include bus drivers (John Doe Hispanic male driver, John Doe white male
18 driver, Jane Doe white female driver, and Jane Doe black female driver), emergency room physicians,
19 employees of Heritage Security Services, Transit System Security, and Fort Heritage Courier Service,
20 forensic psychiatry staff, the Highway Patrol, Board of Commissioners San Diego Unified Port District,
21 and San Diego Ethics Commissioners. *Id.* Plaintiff's allegations relate to a storage unit he rented. *Id.*
22 Plaintiff asserts that he has been injured by several "clusters," and claims, to list a few, "malicious
23 falsehood, loss of enjoyment of life, loss of income, loss of property, obstruction of justice, assault and
24 battery, law enforcement misconduct, retaliation, law enforcement crime, defamation, slander, damage
25 to property, denial of due process, los of consortium, denial of proper medical care..." in violation of

1 the Evidence Code, Evidence Rule, International Immigration Laws, Law Enforcement Code of Ethics,
 2 American Medical Association Code of Ethics, etc. *Id.*

3 In Case No. 2:12-cv-01274-MMD -VCF, plaintiff names as defendants several individuals,
 4 numerous Toyota dealerships, Chevrolet dealerships, Ford dealerships, Scion dealerships, Jeep
 5 dealerships, Dodge dealerships, Honda dealerships, Hyundai dealerships, Lexus dealerships, Nissan
 6 dealerships, Subaru dealerships, Volkswagen dealerships, and Mercedes Benz dealerships, throughout
 7 Utah, New Mexico, Idaho, Arizona, Oregon, Washington, and Colorado, MegaPlex Theaters, KFAN
 8 Radio, All-Star Catering, Energy Solutions Arena, Utah Jazz Store, Fanzz Sports Apparel, and many
 9 more. (#1-1). The list of defendants and the descriptions begin on page eight (8) and end on page forty-
 10 eight (48). *Id.* Plaintiff asserts that he purchased a new 2007 Toyota Sienna from a dealership in New
 11 Mexico and that at some point it was “wrongfully towed and impounded.” *Id.* Plaintiff alleges that
 12 many “clusters” injured him by “malicious falsehood, loss of enjoyment of life, loss of income, loss of
 13 property, defamation, evidence tampering, fraud, retaliation, judicial misconduct, **attempted murder**⁸,
 14 assault and battery, attorney misconduct, damage to property, evidence tampering, theft, fraud, denial
 15 of due process, loss of consortium, bad faith, wrongful arrest and detention, law enforcement
 16 misconduct, law enforcement crime, obstruction of justice, denial of proper medical care...” in violation
 17 of the same codes and rules as in the actions above. *Id* (emphasis added).

18 In Case No. 2:12-cv-01275-MMD -VCF, plaintiff’s list of the defendants begins on page one
 19 (1) and ends on page thirty-seven (37). (#1-1). The allegations in the complaint relate to plaintiff
 20 allegedly being denied the transfer of his Pharmaceutic license. *Id.* In addition to the State of
 21 California, the Office of Attorney General, and the City of San Diego, plaintiff names several
 22 individuals, the Office of the Public Defender, San Diego Police Department, Heritage Security
 23 Services, Transit System Security and Fort Heritage Courier Service, several public transportation

24
 25 ⁸ Plaintiff is advised that criminal allegations such as attempted murder are not proper in a civil complaint. See
 26 Nevada Revised Statute Chapter 200.

1 companies, attorneys and law clerks from New York, Chicago, Maine, California, and Oregon,
2 employees of the Office of the Secretary of State, California Highway Patrol, the same bus drivers as
3 above, and emergency room physicians. *Id.* Plaintiff alleges the same claims as above, such as fraud,
4 evidence tampering, attempted murder, loss of consortium, and denial of proper medical care. *Id.*

5 In Case No. 2:12-cv-01276-JCM -VCF, plaintiff names, among others, transportation service
6 companies and their employees, attorneys, officers, and directors for the San Diego Metropolitan
7 System, several bus drivers for the San Diego Transit System, security officers and employees of
8 Heritage Security Services, Transit System Security, and Fort Heritage Courier Service, employees of
9 the Sheriff's office, and several individuals as defendants. (#1-1). The complaint also relates to
10 plaintiff allegedly being denied the transfer of his Pharmaceutic license. *Id.* The complaint alleges the
11 same claims as seen in the actions above, such as fraud, evidence tampering, attempted murder, loss of
12 consortium, and denial of proper medical care. *Id.*

13 In Case No. 2:12-cv-01277-MMD -VCF, plaintiff names, among others, storage companies in
14 Oregon, the District Attorneys' Office, Board of Commissioners, City of Newport Police, the States of
15 Oregon and California, the Office of County Counsel, Office of the Public Defender, Heritage Security
16 Services, Transit System Security and Fort Heritage Courier Service, San Diego Vintage Trolley, Inc,
17 and several individuals. (#1-1). The allegations in the complaint relate to a storage unit that he was
18 denied access to. *Id.* Plaintiff states that several defendant "clusters" injured plaintiff by hindering,
19 obstructing and sabotaging plaintiff's efforts to timely and properly investigate and/or litigate his
20 severally (sic) applicable cases." *Id.* Plaintiff also makes the same claims as above that the defendant
21 "clusters" engaged in malicious falsehood causing "loss of enjoyment of life, loss of consortium, libel,
22 defamation, slander...attempted murder" etc. *Id.*

23 In Case No. 2:12-cv-01278-GMN -VCF, plaintiff lists the defendants in the first thirty-seven
24 (37) pages of his complaint as including, among others, the United States of America, public storage
25 facilities, police departments, offices of the Public Defender and City Attorney in San Diego, Heritage

1 Security Services, Transit System Security, and Fort Heritage Courier Service, San Diego Vintage
2 Trolley. (#1-1). Plaintiff's claims relate to the rental of a storage unit in Georgia and the subsequent
3 denial of access to the unit. *Id.* Plaintiff states that the defendant "clusters" caused damages to him
4 by "hindering, obstructing and sabotaging plaintiff's efforts to timely and properly investigate and/or
5 litigate his severally (sic) applicable cases" and by engaging in "malicious falsehood." *Id.* Plaintiff
6 asserts the same list of claims for loss of enjoyment of life, loss of consortium, libel, attempted murder,
7 etc. that he asserted in the previous actions. *Id.*

8 In Case No. 2:12-cv-01279-JCM -VCF, plaintiff names, among others, the United States of
9 America, FedEx Corporation, International, Freight East, and Kinko's Office and Print Services,
10 Efficient Workflow Solutions, LLC, State Of California, Office of the Public Defender, San Diego
11 County, California, Office of the City Attorney, City of San Diego, California, County of San Diego
12 Health and Human Services Agency, (HHS) Forensic Services Unit, San Diego, California, Heritage
13 Security Services, Transit System Security, and Fort Heritage Courier Service, San Diego Vintage
14 Trolley, Inc., and San Diego Metropolitan Transit System (SDMTS). (#1-1). The allegations relate to
15 a situation where plaintiff contacted attorneys to represent him in "two potential legal malpractice
16 litigation[s]" and sent them his case files. *Id.* Plaintiff states that defendant "clusters" adversely
17 effected plaintiff by "hindering, obstructing and sabotaging plaintiff's efforts to timely and properly
18 investigate and/or litigate his severally (sic) applicable cases." *Id.* Plaintiff asserts the same list of
19 claims for fraud, theft of property, loss of enjoyment of life, loss of consortium, libel, attempted murder,
20 etc. that he asserted in the previous actions. *Id.*

21 In Case No. 2:12-cv-01280-MMD -VCF, plaintiff names, among others, storage facilities in
22 Texas and other states, the United States of America, several different Kennedy-Wilson companies,
23 several different Behringer Harvard Companies, City of El Paso Police Department, City of San Diego,
24 California, County of San Diego Health and Human Services Agency, (HHS) Forensic Services Unit,
25 San Diego, California, Heritage Security Services, Transit System Security, and Fort Heritage Courier

1 Service, several Veolia companies, San Diego and Arizona Eastern (SD and AE) Railway Company,
 2 and North County Transit District. (#1-1). Plaintiff asserts the same claims as above for fraud, theft
 3 of property, loss of enjoyment of life, loss of consortium, libel, attempted murder, bad faith, wrongful
 4 arrest and detention, denial of proper medical care, etc. *Id.* This complaint also relates to a storage unit
 5 plaintiff acquired and was subsequently denied access to. *Id.*

6 **3. Discussion**

7 “Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8(a)(2) requires only “a short and plain statement of the claim
 8 showing that the pleader is entitled to relief,” in order to “give the defendant fair notice of what the ...
 9 claim is and the grounds upon which it rests.” *Conley v. Gibson*, 355 U.S. 41, 47, 78 S.Ct. 99, 2
 10 L.Ed.2d 80. “[A] plaintiff’s obligation to provide the “grounds” of his “entitle[ment] to relief” requires
 11 more than labels and conclusions, and a formulaic recitation of a cause of action’s elements will not do.”
 12 *Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. 544, 545, 127 S. Ct. 1955, 1959, 167 L. Ed. 2d 929 (2007).
 13 “Factual allegations must be enough to raise a right to relief above the speculative level on the
 14 assumption that all of the complaint’s allegations are true.” *Id.*

15 As demonstrated above, plaintiff’s complaints (#1-1) do nothing more than name individuals,
 16 States, and companies, and make conclusory statements and allegations. *Id.* Plaintiff has not put any
 17 of the defendants on notice of the “grounds of his entitlement to relief.” *Id.* Many of the claims
 18 throughout the complaints (#1-1) are identical to those contained in other complaints, and it appears that
 19 plaintiff copy and pasted claims without regard for the nature of the suit. Plaintiff also asserts very
 20 serious criminal claims which are not proper here, such as attempted murder, against defendant
 21 “clusters,” in an actions where the complaint relates to a car being towed or to a Pharmaceutical license
 22 transfer. (#1-1). Plaintiff names an overwhelming number of defendants in each complaint, many of
 23 which have nothing to do with the claims and/or are exact replicas of those named in other complaints,
 24 in the same copy and paste style as seen with his claims. *Id.*

25 The court should dismiss plaintiff’s claims under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B), as his complaints
 26

(#1-1) are frivolous and fail to state a claim upon which relief may be granted. The court should also dismiss his claims for fraud, as he fails to meet the heightened pleading standard of Rule 9(b). *See Fed. R. Civ. P. 9(b)* (“In alleging fraud or mistake, a party must state with particularity the circumstances constituting fraud or mistake.”). As plaintiff also impermissibly groups defendants together in “clusters” and does not differentiate his allegations, the complaints should be dismissed. *See Destfino v. Reiswig*, 630 F.3d 952, 958 (9th Cir. 2011) (Rule 9(b) “does not allow a complaint to . . . lump multiple defendants together;” instead, it requires the plaintiff “to differentiate [its] allegations when suing more than one defendant”) (citation omitted); *see also United States v. Corinthian Colleges*, 655 F.3d 984, 998 (9th Cir. 2011) (“The Complaint . . . simply attributes wholesale all of the allegations against Corinthian to the Individual Defendants. Rule 9(b) undoubtedly requires more.”).

C. Vexatious Litigant

1. Requirements for Vexatious Litigant Order

The All Writs Act, 28 U.S.C. § 1651(a), empowers federal district courts to enjoin vexatious litigants who have a history of abusing the court’s limited resources. *De Long v. Hennessey*, 912 F.2d 1144, 1147 (9th Cir. 1990) (citing *Tripati v. Beaman*, 878 F.2d 351, 352 (10th Cir. 1989)). Under the All Writs Act, a district court can order a person with lengthy histories of abusive litigation—a vexatious litigant—to obtain leave of the court before filing any future lawsuits. *Molski v. Evergreen Dynasty Corp.*, 500 F.3d 1047, 1057 (9th Cir. 2007).

“Flagrant abuse of the judicial process cannot be tolerated because it enables one person to preempt the use of judicial time that properly could be used to consider the meritorious claims of other litigants.” *DeLong*, 912 F.2d at 1148. However, the Ninth Circuit has cautioned the district courts by recognizing that vexatious litigant orders are an extreme remedy, and should rarely be entered. *De Long*, 912 F.2d at 1148 (citing *Wood v. Santa Barbara Chamber of Commerce, Inc.*, 705 F.2d 1515, 1523-26 (9th Cir. 1984)). This is because such an order restricts access to the courts—the litigant’s “final safeguard for vitally important constitutional rights.” *Wood*, 705 F.2d at 1525. “An injunction

1 cannot issue merely upon a showing of litigiousness. The plaintiff's claims must not only be numerous,
 2 but also be patently without merit." *Moy v. U.S.*, 906 F.2d 467, 470 (9th Cir. 1990) (citing *In re Oliver*,
 3 682 F.2d 443, 446 (3d Cir. 1982)).

4 In deciding whether or not to restrict a litigant's access to the courts, "[u]ltimately, the question
 5 the court must answer is whether a litigant who has a history of vexatious litigation is likely to continue
 6 to abuse the judicial process and harass other parties." *Molski v. Mandarin Touch Rest.*, 347 F.Supp.2d
 7 860, 863–64 (C.D. Cal. 2004) (quoting *Safir v. United States Lines, Inc.*, 792 F.2d 19, 23 (2nd Cir.
 8 1986)). In doing so, the court should examine five factors: (1) the litigant's history of litigation and in
 9 particular whether it entailed vexatious, harassing, or duplicative lawsuits; (2) the litigant's motive in
 10 pursuing the litigation, *e.g.*, does the litigant have an objective good faith expectation of prevailing?;
 11 (3) whether the litigant is represented by counsel; (4) whether the litigant has caused needless expense
 12 to other parties or has posed an unnecessary burden on the courts and their personnel; and (5) whether
 13 other sanctions would be adequate to protect the courts and other parties. *Id.* at 864.

14 **2. Discussion**

15 Upon examining the five factors, the court finds that the plaintiff "is likely to continue to abuse
 16 the judicial process and harass other parties," and must be deemed vexatious. *Molski*, 347 F.Supp.2d
 17 at 863–64. As discussed above, plaintiff has a history of filing lawsuits relating to the same allegations
 18 and claims and against an overwhelming amount of defendants. Plaintiff continues to file lengthy
 19 complaints (#1-1) in districts that do not have any relation to the allegations after the same allegations
 20 have been dismissed by other courts. The first factor, plaintiff's litigation history, supports restricting
 21 plaintiff's access to the court. *Id.*

22 While plaintiff may subjectively believe he will prevail, plaintiff cannot have an objective good
 23 faith expectation of prevailing. Plaintiff did not amend his complaints (#1-1) to state a claim that the
 24 court could comprehend and upon which relief could be granted, even after this court gave him the
 25 opportunity to do so and other courts already dismissed very similar, if not identical, complaints. In

1 plaintiff's responses (#4, #5⁹, and #6¹⁰) to the orders to show cause (#3, #4¹¹, and #5¹²), he did not
 2 attempt to cure the deficiencies pointed out by the court, and only stated that he investigated his claims.
 3 Plaintiff also names defendants in his complaints (#1-1) that have no relation to the underlying
 4 allegations. Several defendants are named in every complaint, and it appears that plaintiff simply copies
 5 and pastes the defendants into each complaint without regard to whether the defendants were even in
 6 the same state where the harm allegedly occurred. A reasonable person would not believe that they had
 7 an expectation of prevailing against defendants that were improperly named and on complaints that have
 8 been previously dismissed for failure to state a claim. Plaintiff's motive, when looked at objectively,
 9 supports a finding that plaintiff is a vexatious litigant. *Id.* The second factor weighs in favor of
 10 restricting plaintiff's access to the court. *Id.* As plaintiff is not represented by counsel, the third factor
 11 weighs in favor as well. *Id.*

12 With regard to whether plaintiff has caused "needless expense to other parties or has posed an
 13 unnecessary burden on the courts," the court has sustained most of this burden. *Id.* This court has
 14 screened plaintiff's many complaints (#1-1), dismissed frivolous claims, and/or ordered plaintiff to
 15 show cause why the complaints should not be dismissed *prior* to the defendants being served and forced
 16 to respond. This process, however, is a long and tedious one, as plaintiff's claims are often repetitive,
 17 disjunctive, and hard to comprehend. The fourth factor weighs in favor of restricting plaintiff's access.
 18 *Id.* The court finds that sanctions would not be appropriate, as plaintiff has already been deemed
 19 vexatious in other courts, but continues to file the same type of complaints. The undersigned
 20 recommends restricting plaintiff's access to this court. *Id.*

21 **3. Enjoining Vexatious Litigant**

22 ⁹Case Nos. 12-cv-01274-MMD-VCF and 12-cv-01276-JCM-VCF

23 ¹⁰Case No. 12-cv-01182-GMN-VCF

24 ¹¹Case Nos. 12-cv-01274-MMD-VCF and 12-cv-01276-JCM-VCF

25 ¹²Case No. 12-cv-01182-GMN-VCF

If a litigant is deemed vexatious, he/she will be enjoined from filing any further action or papers in this district without first obtaining leave of the Chief Judge of this court. In order to file any papers, the vexatious litigant must first file an application for leave. The application must be supported by a declaration of plaintiff stating: (1) that the matters asserted in the new complaint or papers have never been raised and disposed of on the merits by *any court*; (2) that the claim or claims are not frivolous or made in bad faith; and (3) that he has conducted a reasonable investigation of the facts and investigation supports his claim or claims. A copy of the order deeming the litigant vexatious must be attached to any application. Failure to fully comply will be sufficient grounds for denial of the application. *De Long v. Hennessey*, 912 F.2d 1144, 1146–47 (9th Cir. 1990).

RECOMMENDATION

Based on the foregoing, it is the recommendation of the undersigned United States Magistrate Judge that:

- (1) Plaintiff Chibueze C. Anaeme's complaints (#1-1) in the above captioned cases be DISMISSED;
- (2) Plaintiff Chibueze C. Anaeme be deemed a vexatious litigant pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1651(a); and
- (3) the court enter an order stating that if plaintiff Chibueze C. Anaeme intends to file any papers with the court he must first seek leave of the Chief Judge of this court in accordance with the procedure outlined above.

NOTICE

Pursuant to Local Rule IB 3-2, any objection to this Finding and Recommendation must be in writing and filed with the Clerk of the Court within fourteen (14) days. The Supreme Court has held that the courts of appeal may determine that an appeal has been waived due to the failure to file objections within the specified time. *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 142 (1985). This circuit has also held that (1) failure to file objections within the specified time and (2) failure to properly address and

1 brief the objectionable issues waives the right to appeal the District Court's order and/or appeal factual
2 issues from the order of the District Court. *Martinez v. Ylst*, 951 F.2d 1153, 1157 (9th Cir. 1991); *Britt*
3 *v. Simi Valley United Sch. Dist.*, 708 F.2d 452, 454 (9th Cir. 1983).

4 DATED this 9th day of November, 2012.

5 

6 **CAM FERENBACH**
7 **UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE**

8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26